

REMARKS**Status of Claims**

The Office Action mailed June 18, 2007 has been reviewed and the comments therein were carefully considered. Claims 1-5, 8-10, 12-16, 19-21, 23-27, 29-31 and 33 are pending in the application, with Claims 1-5, 8-10, 12-16, 19-21, 23-27, 29-31 and 33 currently rejected. Claims 4, 12 and 23 are canceled.

New Counsel

Applicant notes that new counsel has been appointed for this patent application. A Power of Attorney to Prosecute Applications Before the USPTO along with change of address form was filed on September 24, 2007. A Notice of Acceptance of Power of Attorney dated September 28, 2007 has been received by our office.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-5, 8-16, 19-21, 23-27, 29-31 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowe et al (U.S. Patent 5,623,613) in view of Boylan, III et al (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0166120 A1). Applicant traverses this rejection.

Regarding Claim 4, the Office Action states:

Referring to claims 4, 8, 15, 19,26,29, and 31, the combination of Rowe et al. and Boylan, III et al. teaches the system/method of claims 1, 12, 24, 27, and 30, wherein the EPG objects comprise a first class of objects (summary panel 90) providing a plurality of virtual worlds included in the 3-D EPG (the examiner notes that the information shown in summary panel 90 corresponds to the selected tile appearing within the viewing panel 58) (Rowe et al. col.14, l. 8-55 & col. 15, l.1-30).

Applicant asserts that neither Rowe nor Boylan disclose anything regarding virtual worlds. There is no mention of “virtual world” in either reference, and there is no description or suggestion in either reference about “objects providing a plurality of virtual worlds”. The Office Action is apparently stating that a tile in Rowe is equivalent to a virtual world, without further explanation. Applicant respectfully asserts that the references either alone or combined do not

disclose or suggest the feature of “a plurality of virtual worlds”. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that Claim 4 (and also similar Claims 15 and 26) is allowable.

Applicant has amended Independent Claims 1, 12, and 23. Specifically, Claim 1 was amended to include Claim 4; Claim 12 was amended to include Claim 15; and Claim 23 was amended to include Claim 26. Claims 4, 12 and 23 were canceled, and Claims 9, 16, and 27 were amended to update their dependency. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that all independent claims, and all claims that depend upon them, are allowable.

With regard to Claim 8, the Office Action provides no explanation on how Rowe and Boylan disclose the feature of “wherein the 3-D EPG includes a presentation of a virtual world related to content selected by a user.” Applicant asserts that neither Rowe nor Boylan, either alone or combined, disclose or suggest this feature, and that Claim 8 is allowable separately from its dependence upon an allowable parent claim. Applicant asserts that this same argument applies to Claims 19, 29 and 31.

Conclusion

All rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number set forth below.

Date: October 16, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David D. Lowry
Registration No. 38,538
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
28 State Street, 28th Floor
Boston, MA 02109-1775
Telephone: 617-720-9600
Fax: 617-720-9601